



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,609	11/03/2006	Fedrik Joabsson	613-107	3566
23117 7590 09/04/2009 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
KUMAR, PREETI				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/04/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/578,609

**Applicant(s)**

JOABSSON ET AL.

**Examiner**

PREETI KUMAR

**Art Unit**

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 November 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG/US)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/8/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Non-Final Rejection***

***Priority***

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 5/8/2006 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
3. Claims 1-4, 7-9,11-17, 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Landh et al. (US 5,531,925).

Landh et al. teach colloidal particles, comprising an interior phase of a non-lamellar reversed cubic, intermediate or hexagonal liquid crystalline phase, or a homogeneous L3 phase, and a surface phase of a lamellar crystalline or liquid crystalline phase, or an L3 phase. A method of preparing such particles by creating a local dispersible phase, within the homogeneous phase, preferably by means of a fragmentation agent, and fragmentating the homogeneous phase so as to form said surface phase. Several medical as well as non-medical uses of the particles referred to, e.g. as an antigen-presenting system, as a delivery system for anticancer, antifungal and antimicrobial drugs, and as carriers of nucleic acids or nucleotides. See abstract.

Regarding the claimed cationic peptide active agent having an isoelectric point of above 7.0, Landh et al. teach somatostatin (octreotide), like most polypeptide hormones, has a very low solubility in water and tends to associate into various types of molecular aggregates. The solubility of monomeric somatostatin (molecular weight 1637.9) in aqueous solution has been estimated to be 0.3 mg/ml. Furthermore, it has a net charge of 4 and a pI=10. See col.14,ln.15-25.

Regarding the claimed active agent being released over a period of 2-14 days, Landh et al. teach liposome-associated polypeptides have been used to sustain the delivery of many polypeptides through various routes, and to some extent it has been shown that the delivery of intact and bioactive polypeptides can be prolonged for days and possibly longer. See col.22,ln.20-25.

Regarding the claimed neutral structure forming amphiphile, Landh et al. teach glycerol monooleate (GMO). See col.5,ln.15 and col.14,ln.15-45.

Regarding the fatty acid, Landh et al. teach that the GMO prepared by molecular distillation was purchased from Grindsted Products A/S, glycerol monooleate (GMO) (85-06) (074832-FF 8-009), (Braband, Denmark), and consisted of 98.8% monoglycerides, 1.0% glycerol, 1.0% diglycerides and 1.0% free fatty acids. The fatty acid composition was C16:0:0.5, C18:0:2.0, C18:1:92.3, C18:2:4.3, C18:3:trace, C20:4:0.5 wt. %, as stated by the supplier. Purified poloxamer 407, also name, Pluronic F-127, was obtained from BASF Corporation (Wyan-dotte, USA). Soybean phosphatidylcholine (SPC) was purchased from Lucas Meyr (Epikuron 200) with a fatty acid pattern according to Rydhag (1979) of: C8:0.8, C12:2:12.2. C16:1:0.4, C18:2.7, C18:1:10.7, C18:2:67.2 and C18:3:6.0. Double distilled water was used in all experiments. See col.11,ln.35-50.

Regarding the claimed 0.5 to 20% of at least one anionic structure forming amphiphile, Landh et al. teach amphiphilic polymers comprising anionic alkylsulfates; soaps; sulfosuccinates. See col.16,ln.31.

Regarding the claimed fragmentation agent, Landh et al. teach surface active polymers including glycoproteins as mucins and polysaccharides as alginate, propylene glycol alginate, gum arabic, xanthan, carragenan, polyvinylpyrrolidone (PVP) and carboxymethyl-cellulose. See col.10,ln.45-50.

Regarding the claimed oxygen containing biotolerable organic solvent, Landh et al. teach Delivery of oxygen can be achieved by the preparation of an oxygen carrier, such as the heme group in hemoglobin or similar protein, in a cubic phase. Cubic phases in the system hemoglobin-GMO-water have been investigated and are formed with high amounts of protein (>5 wt. %). Such a system can be used as blood substitute and in connection with radiation therapy of cancer. The use of polymerizable lipids, in such systems as described above could be used to enhance stability and shelf-life. See col.27,ln.15-20.

Lundh et al. teach that diacylglycerol can be incorporated. See col.16,ln.38. In col.23, Lundh et al. illustrate intravenous somatostatin formulation in rabbit and intranasal insulin formulation in the rat. Accordingly, the teachings of Landh et al. appear to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Alternatively, even if the teachings of Landh et al. are not sufficient to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to arrive at 0.5 to 20% of at least one anionic structure forming amphiphile because Landh et al. teach amphiphilic polymers comprising anionic alkylsulfates; soaps; sulfosuccinates. See col.16,ln.31.

4. Claims 5, 6, 10, 18, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landh et al. (US 5,531,925).

Landh et al. are relied upon as set forth above.

Landh et al. do not specifically teach the claimed oral bioavailability as recited by the instant claim 5. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to arrive at the claimed oral bioavailability as recited by the instant claims, since Landh et al. teach the analogous peptide hormone, somatostatin (ocreoide) in a non-lamellar phase glycerol monoleate-somatostatin-water system for therapeutic intravenous delivery. The use of similar materials (i.e. somatostatin (ocreoide) in a non-lamellar phase glycerol monoleate-somatostatin-water system) and in the similar steps (i.e. therapeutic intravenous administration) is reasonably expected to achieve the claimed oral availability.

Landh et al. do not specifically teach the claimed peptidase inhibitor as recited by the instant claim 6. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to arrive at the claimed peptidase inhibitor as recited by the instant claims, since Landh et al. specifically motivate one of ordinary skill to protect from several properties of polypeptides and proteins that impede their delivery including their short biological half-life.

Landh et al. do not specifically teach the claimed increase of the half life of peptide active agent as recited by the instant claim 10. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to arrive at the claimed increase of the half life of peptide active agent as recited by the instant claims,

since Landh et al. teach the analogous peptide hormone, somatostatin (ocreoitide) in a non-lamellar phase glycerol monoleate-somatostatin-water system for therapeutic intravenous delivery and Landh et al. specifically motivate one of ordinary skill to protect from several properties of polypeptides and proteins that impede their delivery including their short biological half-life in intravenous drug delivery.

Finally, Landh et al. do not specifically teach the claimed release of the active agent over 2 to 14 days as recited by the instant claim 18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made to arrive at the claimed release of the active agent over 2 to 14 days as recited by the instant claims, since Landh et al. specifically teach one of ordinary skill that for some polypeptides a duration of their delivery and a prolongation of their biological half-life may be of relevance and increase the bioavailability and/or efficiency. Currently most formulations of polypeptides have been concerned with the rather trivial question of increasing the biological half-life upon administration. Preparations such as liposome-associated polypeptides have been used to sustain the delivery of many polypeptides through various routes, and to some extent it has been shown that the delivery of intact and bioactive polypeptides can be prolonged for days and possibly longer. See col.22,ln.15-30.

### ***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.



Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PREETI KUMAR whose telephone number is (571)272-1320. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 am-3:30 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory R. Del Cotto/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/P. K./  
Examiner, Art Unit 1796